

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed September 7, 2005. Claims 1-19, 21-25, and 27-29 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

1. Response To Rejections of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, 21-25, 27, and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Milligan* (U.S. Patent No. 6,555,480). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed subject matter must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). In the present case, not every feature of the claimed subject matter is represented in the *Milligan* reference. Applicants discuss the *Milligan* reference and Applicants' claims in the following.

a. Claims 1-5 and 7-12

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

A method comprising:
forming a plurality of slot portions in a substrate; and,
etching a trench in the substrate contiguous with the plurality of slot portions to form a compound slot *such that at least one reinforcement structure extends across the compound slot to connect substrate material on opposite sides of the compound slot.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Milligan* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "such that at least one reinforcement structure extends across the compound slot to connect substrate material on opposite sides of the compound slot," as recited and emphasized above in claim 1. As a result, *Milligan* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and claims 2-5 & 7-12 (which depend from claim 1) are not anticipated by

Milligan, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

b. Claims 14-19

As provided in independent claim 14, Applicants claim:

A method comprising:
forming a plurality of slot portions into a first surface of a substrate wherein the substrate has a thickness defined between the first surface and a generally opposing second surface; and,
exposing both the first and second surfaces of the substrate to an etchant sufficient to remove substrate material to form a compound slot while *retaining substrate material comprising at least one reinforcement structure extending across the compound slot to connect substrate material on opposite sides of the compound slot*, the substrate being stronger in bending in or out of a plane of at least a portion of a first surface of the substrate than if said at least one reinforcement structure were not present.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 14 is allowable for at least the reason that *Milligan* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "retaining substrate material comprising at least one reinforcement structure extending across the compound slot to connect substrate material on opposite sides of the compound slot," as recited and emphasized above in claim 14. As a result, *Milligan* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 14. Therefore, claim 14 and claims 15-19 (which depend from claim 14) are not anticipated by *Milligan*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

c. Claims 21-25

As provided in independent claim 21, Applicants claim:

A method comprising:
forming a plurality of slot portions into a first surface of a substrate wherein the substrate has thickness defined between the first surface and a generally opposing second surface, adjacent slot portions being separated by substrate material; and,
forming a trench portion into the second surface in fluid flowing relation with the slot portions, the trench portion in combination with the slot portions defining a compound slot, *wherein said forming a trench portion removes substrate material to define a reinforcement structure extending across the compound slot to connect substrate material on opposite sides of the compound slot* and having a terminus proximate the second surface comprising at least two angled walls.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 21 is allowable for at least the reason that *Milligan* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "wherein said forming a trench portion removes substrate material to define a reinforcement structure extending across the compound slot to connect substrate material on opposite sides of the compound slot," as recited and emphasized above in claim 21. As a result, *Milligan* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 21. Therefore, claim 21 and claims 22-25 (which depend from claim 21) are not anticipated by *Milligan*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

d. Claim 27

As provided in independent claim 27, Applicants claim:

A print cartridge substrate forming method, comprising
forming a plurality of slot portions into a first surface of a substrate the
substrate has a thickness defined the first surface and a generally opposing
second surface; and,

exposing both the first and second surfaces of the substrate to an
etchant sufficient to remove substrate material to form a compound slot while
*retaining substrate material comprising at least one reinforcement structure
extending across the compound slot to connect substrate material on
opposite sides of the compound slot*, the substrate being stronger in bending
in or out of a plane of at least a portion of a first surface of the substrate than if
said at least one reinforcement structure were not present.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 27 is allowable for at least the reason that *Milligan* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "retaining substrate material comprising at least one reinforcement structure extending across the compound slot to connect substrate material on opposite sides of the compound slot," as recited and emphasized above in claim 27. As a result, *Milligan* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 27. Therefore, claim 27 is not anticipated by *Milligan*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

e. **Claim 29**

As provided in independent claim 29, Applicants claim:

A fluid-ejecting device forming method comprising:
forming a plurality of fluid-handling structures over a first surface of a semiconductor substrate;
removing material from the substrate sufficient to form a plurality of slot portions in the substrate; and,
etching through at least some of the fluid-handling structures to form a generally elongate trench in the substrate which is in fluid-flowing relation with the plurality of slot portions.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 29 is allowable for at least the reason that *Milligan* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the above recited steps. Further, the Office Action has failed to provide an explanation of a basis for the rejection of claim 29. As a result, a prima facie case of anticipation has not been established. Therefore, the rejection of claim 29 should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

2. **Response To Rejections of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-9, 11-12, 14-19, and 21-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Soik* (U.S. Patent No. 6,745,469). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Regarding claims 1-9 and 11-12, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Soik* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "such that at least one reinforcement structure extends across the compound slot to connect substrate material on opposite sides of the compound slot," as recited and emphasized above in claim 1. As a result, *Soik* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and claims 2-9 and 11-12 (which depend from claim 1) are not anticipated by *Soik*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

Regarding claims 14-19, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 14 is allowable for at least the reason that *Soik* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "retaining substrate material comprising at least one reinforcement structure extending across the compound slot to connect substrate material on opposite sides of the compound slot," as recited and emphasized above in claim 14. As a result, *Soik* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 14. Therefore, claim 14 and claims 15-19 (which depend


from claim 14) are not anticipated by *Soik*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

Regarding claims 21-25, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 21 is allowable for at least the reason that *Soik* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "wherein said forming a trench portion removes substrate material to define a reinforcement structure extending across the compound slot to connect substrate material on opposite sides of the compound slot," as recited and emphasized above in claim 21. As a result, *Soik* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 21. Therefore, claim 21 and claims 22-25 (which depend from claim 21) are not anticipated by *Soik*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283